

and (437) "The Gate of Honour, Caius College," are very clever:—the latter is not a picture, but a building. Mr. Anthony possesses much genius, but should put himself into harness.

Mr. Herring maintains his position as a painter of horses and farm-stock, as is evidenced by No. 72, "Cavaliers Regaling;" 412, "Seven for Sixpence;" and 485, "Farm-yard, Winter."—Mr. Wilson, jun., has, amongst others, a fresh and breezy sea piece (34), "Clearing up after a Storm."—Mr. J. J. Hall, in (34) "The Gleaners," No. 214, from Thompson, and (388) "A Shepherd Boy," shows a mastery of rustic forms and expression.

Mr. Pyne has but one picture (60), "Landing Herrings on Yorkshire Coast," which to our minds has less beauty than some of his previous works.

Mr. H. Boddington has several pretty landscapes: his most important work "An Autumnal Noon on the Mountains" (81) is nearly a fine work.—Mr. Cole in cattle and landscape (112) and (439) shows great advance.—Mr. Woolmer has refined his style. (100) "From the Sleeping Palace, approach of the Prince;" (363) "Greenwich Park" and (474) "An Italian Villa" more particularly pleased us.

(No. 118) "Near Tooting, Kent," and (154) "Don't be Afraid," are pleasant specimens of Mr. Tennant's art.—In Mr. Clint's largest picture (123) "St. Brelade's Bay, Jersey," the mist clearing off is injurious to the effect. (156) "Sunset," (374) "Hamstead, Heath" (which is charming) please us better.

In Mr. Hassell's principal picture (179), "The Thames at Lambeth" (a clever work), the Royal Tower of the New Houses of Parliament is made to appear out of upright by a light on the lower part of it.

Mr. G. Smith has two pictures, which, though small, are entitled to great praise.—No. 257, "Labour," and 265, "Enjoyment."

(259), "The Wreath," by Mr. Salter, is more successful than his more ambitious attempt, "The Marriage of Bacchus."—(333), by Mr. W. West, "Mountain Torrent, Norway," is one of his best, though not his latest. We would further mention Mr. Clater's (401), "From Burne," and 445, "Carting Sea-weed," by Mr. Wainwright (reminiscent of Collyns), and will close our notice by mentioning that the sales at the private view amounted to nearly 800*l.*, and comprised thirty-two pictures.

#### THRONES AND CHANCELS IN PRIMITIVE CHURCHES.

It must surely be inherent consciousness of the weakness of the position he is advocating, which induces your correspondent "S" to attempt to prop it up, by asserting that "the case is so obvious, that it seems like trifling to go on with it," and that "I failed in bringing any kind of evidence in favour of my opinion, the passage cited from Justin Martyr being absolutely silent on all the questions at issue." Such assertions on the part of your correspondent go for nothing, and are simply begging the question.

I quoted Justin Martyr, as proving incidentally, in connection with St. Paul's reproof to the Corinthians for certain errors in their mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper, that that mode of celebration was by sitting at a supper-table, the president presiding; first partaking of a solemn meal, and then receiving the sop and wine, precisely as the holy rule had been first instituted. And as Justin observes, that all were assembled together both from town and country, his evidence is conclusive, that the communion was not celebrated on an altar, and not in the chancel, which in no ancient church bore such a proportion to it as to be capable of accommodating a number of persons,—a point which it requires no laboured argument to prove, because the still existing ancient chancels put this matter beyond dispute.

The fact that Christianity was, in course of ages, Paganised and Judaised, corrupted and changed from its original simplicity and purity, both in doctrine and practice, no student of

church history will, I should imagine, venture to dispute: these corruptions and changes were not made all at once, but insinuated themselves by degrees; one error bringing on another, and each change introducing a friend. Bearing this fact in mind, we shall be at no loss to account for the fact which I asserted in my last letter, that erroneous notions respecting the Lord's Supper prevailed in the writings of the Fathers long previous to these notions being able to produce those changes from the ancient architectural precedents, which ultimately were effected. Thus they wrote about "altars" and "holy of holies" long before any semblance to such things existed in a Christian church; just as ambitious presidents, inflated with pride, wrote about their superiority to all earthly powers, and forged documents to prove their position, ages before they could get kings and magistrates and people to be foolish enough to believe in, and to submit to, such priestly pretensions. In fact, these very pretensions relied mainly for support on this very conversion of a table into an altar, and the minister's platform into a "holy of holies." It is curious to trace the remarkable ingenuity with which those writers who support these priestly usurpations over the rights of the people, first couple the proper designation of the chancel with an *alias*, and then gradually adopt the adjunctive term to the exclusion of the original one. Thus the original simple seat of the apostolic presidents is termed a seat or throne; and Cardinal Wiseman at last boldly claims it as having always been "a throne:" the table or altar eventually is only known as the latter; and the minister's platform, the "bema," which is merely the Greek word for an elevated platform, and identical in application with the Latin word *Cancelli*, first becomes the Bema or Sanctuary, and then is known only as the "Holy of Holies." Only conceive what an or that must be that can thus couple and transmute in will two words,—the one conveying such homely common-place notions,—the other, ideas of such infinite purity and holiness that the devout mind can only think of them with awe and bated breath,—the platform, or the HOLY OF HOLIES,—the minister, or God!

In the only material "holy of holies" that ever existed on earth, the high-priest entered once only in the year, and then with shoeless feet. The purest gold formed its floor, and lined its walls and roof; and seven times in the fire was the gold purified, ere it was deemed pure enough, to form the vessels used in that sacred place.

With this glorious, symbolical "holy of holies," did impious writers, in after ages, dare to compare the unpretending platforms in the Christian church. When bishops wrote and called it by this name, it could only have been because they sat on it. Whately, as quoted by "S.," speaks of "the Sacarium, since called the chancel." The proper way for Whately to have written would have been, the chancel or platform, since called the Sacarium. That which Eusebius designates the "holy of holies," was not the chancel, but the table itself, when in the centre of the church in which it stood. Eusebius, with all his talent as a writer, indulged in the most high-flown hyperbolical expressions, and his servile adulation of the Emperor, to flatter whose vanity did he write his pompously inflated description of the churches which Constantine had built, is most disgusting. It is not much to be wondered at in such a writer, that he resorted to the gorgeous descriptions of the Jewish Temple for terms by which to set off to greater advantage the works the Emperor had constructed (which Mr. Pugin sweepingly condemns as "Pagan"),—perverting the Scriptures to the extent of stating that the divine oracles had this church in view when these words were uttered,—"And the glory of this latter house shall far exceed the former." And because the roof was covered with cedar (24-inches thick, ploughed and tongued), asserting that on this point the divine oracles had not been silent, "In which it is said, the trees of the Lord shall rejoice, even the cedars of Libanus which he hath planted." Eusebius further states, that "when the Emperor had

thus finished the Temple, and adorned it with thrones, which he erected in the highest or chiefest place in honour of the *presidents*, and also with lower seats, placed in decent order all over the Temple, he at last placed the holy of holies, to wit, the altar, in the middle, which he made every way accessible to the multitude, by a separation of net-work of wood, wrought and carved with such accurate skill and art as makes as wonderful a spectacle as eyes can behold."

Reduced to the language of common sense. Eusebius's statement amounts to this, that there was a raised platform at one end of the church for the president, and seats round the church for the people, the table being in the middle, and surrounded by a carved railing. So that if this "altar" was rightly designated the "Holy of Holies," the people clearly had it all to themselves, and the president and his associates at the far end of the church must have been shut out from it.

We have seen that Eusebius designates Constantine a second Solomon, which he certainly was not;—the church, a temple, to which it bore no resemblance whatever;—the table, the holy of holies and the altar, both of which terms were equally inappropriate. The altar, even in the tabernacle, and partly of wood for convenience of transport, was yet lined with brass, and had its four horns and trenches: in Solomon's temple it was of stone; and in the Pagan temple, stone was also the material employed. In all, one form appears to have been followed, that which its use required, in offering up a material sacrifice; and to Jews or Pagans, there was therefore absolutely nothing whatever in the Christian communion table to suggest any idea of an altar. If Rome tell truth, she has got the actual table, a wooden one, used by St. Peter: compare this relic as it exists in the church of St. John Lateran with any of the ancient altars, and see if there be a shadow of resemblance between them. The simple fact is, that the Fathers your correspondent quotes, use the term "altar" in the same sense in which St. Paul uses it when he says, "We have an altar not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;" but the Fathers, not content with the simple language of Scripture, loaded their sentences with hyperbole to such an extent, that they were obliged to add others to explain that they only meant to convey a spiritual meaning. Even without this explanation of theirs, the fact that it was at a table the early Christians sat, when partaking of the Lord's Supper,—that the faithful were all within the place of worship, instead of, as in the temple, all without,—that the president was only separated from the people by a low railing, and at the most important part of the ceremonies sat amongst his brethren at the head of the table,—these practical commentaries, so significant to a people previously accustomed to usages so totally opposite, must have sufficed to prove to those to whom such writings were addressed, that the language employed was symbolical, and so employed because the images were, to them all, those of old familiar things, that, to them, had passed away for ever.

With such practical commentaries as their daily customs supplied, how significant becomes that answer of the Christians to the Pagans who reproached them with having no altars: "altars and shrines we have none." Your correspondent, while admitting the truth of this quotation, attempts to explain it away, and puts in italics these words: "It is true that the early Christians admitted, as between themselves and the Pagans and the Jews, that they had no altars." "As between themselves and the Pagans and the Jews,"—why that meant between themselves and the world; and if the Romanists are right in their views respecting transubstantiation, the Christians, in giving that answer, were uttering a contemptible falsehood, for the express purpose of making their own religion appear worse in the eyes of its enemies.

Your correspondent, with that respectable authority, Mr. Bingham, appears to have got into a sad mess about the ancient positions of the communion table, from their idea being so biased by its modern position, as to cause